



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,073	06/04/2001	Emir Gurur	8003-391	6810

21971 7590 12/31/2002

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 PAGE MILL ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 943041050

EXAMINER

KACKAR, RAM N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/874,073

Applicant(s)

GURER ET AL.

Examiner

Ram N Kackar

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 45-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 45-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The mechanical hardness in these claims is claimed to be relative to quantities which themselves are variable. It is therefore, hard to ascertain the range of mechanical hardness claimed. Range of mechanical hardness given in standard units would overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 45-46 and 55-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al (US 6149727) in view of Inoue Kazuo (09-260471).

Yoshioka et al disclose a process chamber comprising a media delivery member (Fig 1-9), a spin chuck (Fig 1-20), a vacuum line coupled to the spin chuck (Fig 1-2), the wafer support surface area smaller than the wafer (Fig 1-20), plurality of point contact support structures (Fig 2 and Fig 3- 27) and a line contact vacuum ring (Fig 2-24).

Yoshioka et al do not disclose a coating layer on the spin chuck.

Inoue Kazuo discloses a vacuum chuck with silicon carbide coating to provide good anti abrasive characteristics and reduced contamination (Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have a silicon based coating on the spin chuck to reduce micro-contamination and increase operating life of the chuck due to reduced abrasion.

5. Claim 47-48 and 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al (US 6149727) in view of Inoue Kazuo (09-260471) as applied to claim 45 and further in view of Chu et al (US 6120660).

Inoue Kazuo disclose a vacuum chuck with silicon carbide coating to provide good anti abrasive characteristics and reduced contamination but do not disclose several other silicon based coatings useful for contamination control.

Chu et al disclose a susceptor coated by a silicon-bearing compound (Col 6 lines 48- 60) like silicon dioxide (Col 12 claim 5). The thickness of the coating is disclosed to be 0.5- 2.0 micron (Col 7 lines 18-19). Chu et al also teach that a silicon-bearing compound for protective layer is especially useful when a silicon substrate is used (Col 6 line 67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to make sure that the coating is of silicon bearing compound, as silicon is generally the material of substrates for processing on the spin chuck.

Claim 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al (US 6149727) in view of Inoue Kazuo (09-260471) as applied to claim 45 and further in view of Lu et al (US 5904778).

Yoshioka et al do not disclose the thickness of the silicon-bearing layer.

Art Unit: 1763

Lu et al disclose a protective layer of silicon carbide less than 100 micron (Col 6 lines 21-22) enough for protection. Too thick coatings could have problem of peeling off.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to make sure the thickness of the protective coating is enough for protection as too thick layers may not be stable.

6. Claim 60-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al (US 6149727) in view of Inoue Kazuo (09-260471) as applied to claim 45 and further in view of Chen et al (US 5904778).

Yoshioka et al do not disclose a skirt around the periphery of the wafer support surface.

Chen et al disclose a skirt for thermal shielding around the periphery of the wafer support surface (Fig 1-48), which does not support the substrate and is of a size that the total is greater than the size of substrate.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have a skirt of thermal shield material so as to provide temperature uniformity on the substrate support surface.

7. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al (US 6149727) in view of Inoue Kazuo (09-260471) as applied to claim 45 and further in view of Takamori et al (US 6306455).

Yoshioka et al do not disclose a wafer transporter.

Takamori et al disclose a transport means for the spin chuck (Fig 7-22 and Col 3 lines 19-20).

Art Unit: 1763

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have transport means for higher throughput.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 5868848 and JP 53-66164, 52-84964.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N Kackar whose telephone number is 703 305 3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on 703 308 1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872 9310 for regular communications and 703 872 9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0661.

RK
December 28, 2002

